



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,371	09/02/2004	Isao Sasaki	NEC 02P211	9956
27667	7590	07/06/2010		
HAYES SOLOWAY P.C.			EXAMINER	
3450 E. SUNRISE DRIVE, SUITE 140			PERVAN, MICHAEL	
TUCSON, AZ 85718				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2629	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/06/2010	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

admin@hayes-soloway.com
smckniff@hayes-soloway.com
nsoloway@hayes-soloway.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/506,371

Examiner

Michael Pervan

Applicant(s)

SASAKI ET AL.

Art Unit

2629

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

THE REPLY FILED 07 June 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: 4-12, 17-25 and 43

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3, 13-16, 26, 44 and 45

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached *Information Disclosure Statement(s)*. (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

/Amr Awad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2629

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant (on pages 2-3 of argument) argues that Dingwall does not disclose discharging the holding capacitor. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., variation in characteristics of the drive transistor is compensated to reduce the variation in luminance) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Applicant (on pages 2-3 of argument) argues that Dingwall does not disclose discharging the holding capacitor. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Dingwall discloses that a charge is stored on a capacitor and that this charge is used to maintain the current flow to the OLED and thus continue to emit light (col. 3, lines 18-29). In order for the charge to maintain the flow, it must be discharged. This helps to prevent flicker and thus improve the image quality of the display. Therefore, Dingwall still reads on the claims and the rejection stands.

Applicant (on page 3 of argument) argues that Dingwall and Tanaka do not disclose the predetermined time being less than a frame time. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Dingwall discloses that a charge is stored on a capacitor and that this charge is used to maintain the current flow to the OLED and thus continue to emit light (col. 3, lines 18-29). The charge being stored is equivalent to a writing period and the charge being discharged to continue to emit light is equivalent to a driving period. Since a writing period and a driving period make up a frame, the predetermined period (driving period) is less than a frame time. Therefore, Dingwall and Tanaka still read on the claims and the rejection stands.

Applicant (on page 4 of argument) argues that Dingwall does not hold a voltage between the second gate electrode and the second source electrode. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Dingwall discloses in Figure 2 that the capacitor holds a charge between a gate electrode and ground. It also indirectly holds a charge between the gate electrode and the source electrode via the pixel. Since the claims do not specify a direct connection to the second gate electrode and a direct connection to the second source electrode, Dingwall still reads on the claims and the rejection stands.

Applicant (on pages 4-5 of argument) argues that Ikeda does not disclose the pixel display element being serially connected to the drive transistor. Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Also, in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., variation in characteristics of the drive transistor is compensated to reduce the variation in luminance) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).